

## REMARKS

Claims 1-9, 14-23, 25, and 27 are pending. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejections is respectfully requested in view of the remarks.

Claims 1-23, 25, and 27 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Parise (USPN 6,114,834 & 6,792,259, hereinafter Parise '834 and Parise '259). The Examiner stated essentially that the teachings of Parise '834 and Parise '259 teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1-23, 25, and 27.

Claim 1 claims, *inter alia*, "a charging device, the charging device comprising an upper base, a lower base, at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base and at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base and wherein at least one laser source is disposed in the upper base." Claim 23 claims, *inter alia*, "at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base; and at least one inner wall extending from the upper based towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base."

Parise '834 and Parise '259 each teach a system and method for wireless energy transmission, and more particularly to a method for charging a battery powered motor vehicle. Neither Parise '834 nor Parise '259 teach or suggest "a charging device, the charging device comprising an upper base, a lower base, at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base and at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base and wherein at least one laser source is disposed in the upper base" as claimed in Claim 1, or "at least one outer wall connecting the lower base to the upper base; and at least one inner wall extending from the upper

based towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base” as claimed in Claim 23.

Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 each individually fail to teach or suggest “at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. For example, the rechargeable device of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 is mounted within a motor vehicle while the charging device is mounted on a structure outside of the motor vehicle (see for example, Figures 1 of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259). The garage of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 (see FIG. 10) includes walls supporting a structure. The garage of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259 clearly does not include “at least one inner wall extending from the upper base towards the lower base, wherein the at least one inner wall does not contact to the lower base” as claimed in Claims 1 and 23. Therefore, Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259, individually or in combination, fail to teach or suggest all the limitations of Claims 1 and 23.

In the Response to Arguments the Examiner suggests that the prior art teaches “the specific set-up of the walls as claimed” and attempts to support this position by suggesting that the Applicant has not pointed out why a laser mounted in a housing to align with a receptor is important. Respectfully, the specification gives an explicit exemplary purpose for the claimed arrangement of walls; “The plurality of laser sources 225 are arranged between the inner wall 232 and the outer wall 234, so that laser light emitted by the laser sources 225 is contained between the inner wall 232 and the outer wall 234” (see page 10, line 16, to page 11, line 9). Further, Applicants reiterate that the Examiner fails to address the claimed structure of the charging device (e.g., the inner and outer walls). Therefore, the rejection fails to make out a *prima facie* case of obviousness in view of Parise ‘834 and Parise ‘259.

In addition, the proposed modification of Parise '834 and Parise '259 would render the references unfit for their intended purpose. Consider the implications of the claimed walls extending from the upper base, the walls containing the power transmission of Parise '834 and Parise '259 which clearly require a movable receptor (see col. 7, lines 22-27 of Parise '259) or a movable power transmission unit (see col. 7, lines 42-47 of Parise '259); a references require a moveable element to transmit power. Walls containing the power transmission would prevent the movable requirement of the power transmission. Further, an inner wall extending from a ceiling of a garage environment would prevent a vehicle from entering the garage, destroying the intended purpose of the garage having a power transmission unit.

Claims 2-9, 14-22 depend from Claim 1. Claims 25 and 27 depend from Claim 23. The dependent claims are believed to be allowable for at least the reasons given for respective independent claims. Claims 10-13, 24, 26, and 28-31 were previous canceled. The Examiner's reconsideration of the rejection is respectfully requested.

For the forgoing reasons, the present application, including claims 1-9, 14-23, 25, and 27, is believed to be in condition for allowance. The Examiner's early and favorable action is respectfully urged.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 29, 2008

/Nathaniel T. Wallace/  
Nathaniel T. Wallace  
Reg. No. 48,909  
Attorney for Applicants

**F. CHAU & ASSOCIATES, LLC**  
130 Woodbury Road  
Woodbury, New York 11797  
TEL: (516) 692-8888  
FAX: (516) 692-8889